

To: CN=Ayn Schmit/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: CN=David Jewett/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Rick Wilkin/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
From: CN=Dominic DiGiulio/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Mon 7/23/2012 7:16:48 PM
Subject: Re: question about the internal peer review of the research brief

Ayn:

Dave is better poised to answer the former question on timing.

With regard to the latter question: Appendix A on purging discussion and methods is already over 25 pages. Appendix B on QA/QC is already over 80 pages. The research brief itself may be 15-20 pages.

It is starting to look more like a report than a brief.

Purging and QA/QC discussions are important to critical review of this brief. Rick and I are expending considerable effort in these areas .

Dominic C. DiGiulio, Ph.D.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
Ground Water and Ecosystem Restoration Division
919 Kerr Research Drive
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

580-436-8605 (phone)
580-436-8614 (fax)
580-583-7329 (mobile)

From: Ayn Schmit/R8/USEPA/US
To: David Jewett/ADA/USEPA/US@EPA, Dominic DiGiulio/ADA/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/23/2012 01:54 PM
Subject: question about the internal peer review of the research brief

CONFIDENTIAL- DELIBERATIVE PROCESS

We are exploring having Andrew Schmidt as a peer reviewer. Two questions for you that are not clear from the timeline- what is the proposed timing/duration of the internal peer review? (as opposed to getting input on the draft from the Pavillion project team). And, do you have a rough sense of how long the research brief will be, so we have some idea of the workload? Let me know- thanks

Ayn E. Schmit
Water Policy Advisor

(PH) 303-312-6220 (FAX) 303-312-7150
EPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-1129
schmit.ayn@epa.gov